

LP

F

5012

1888

P2



3 9004 01437785 4

ENGLAND

IRELAND

SCOTLAND

AND

NEWFOUNDLAND

WALES

DOMINION OF CANADA

N. South Wales

New Zealand

South Australia

Tasmania

Cape of G. Hope

Honduras

Leeward Islands

Labuan

Heligoland

Jamaica

West African
Settlements

Hong Kong

Fiji Islands

Mauritius

REPRINT OF

MR. GEO. PARKIN'S

ARTICLE IN THE

NOVEMBER, 1888, NUMBER OF THE "CENTURY."

DR. BEERS'

SPEECH AT SYRACUSE, NEW YORK.

MR. CATTANACH'S

(PRESIDENT OF THE TORONTO BRANCH)

LETTER TO THE GLOBE, APRIL, 1889.

THE "EMPIRE'S" INTERVIEW

WITH

MR. HOPKINS

(JOINT SECRETARY OF THE LEAGUE IN CANADA)

Victoria

Queensland

West Australia

Ceylon

Natal

Guiana

Windward Isles

Trinidad

Bahamas

New Guinea

Straits
Settlements

St. Helena

Cyprus

Bermuda

Gibraltar

INDIA

MALTA

PERIM

ADEN

FALKLAND ISLANDS

L
F5012

1888P2



THE REORGANIZATION OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE

BY GEORGE R. PARKIN, ESQ., M.A.

The development of the Anglo-Saxon race, as we rather loosely call the people which has its home in the British Isles, has become, within the last century, the chief factor and central feature in human history. The flux of population, by which new and great centres of human activity are created, has been so overwhelmingly Anglo-Saxon that nearly all minor currents are absorbed and assimilated by it. In the new continents over which the race is spreading, the offshoots of other European families for the most part lose their identity, and tend to disappear in the dominant mass. Since it has found space on which to expand it has increased with great rapidity, and seems destined ultimately to surpass, in mere mass of numbers, any other branch of the human stock, while its comparative influence is indefinitely increased by the singular individual energy of its members and the collective energy of its communities. Add to this the fact that it embodies the most aggressive moral forces and the most progressive political and social forces of the world, and we have sufficient grounds on which to predict for it a future of supreme interest, and infinitely greater than its past.

The bifurcation of Anglo-Saxon national life which was caused by the American Revolution is now, after a hundred years, fully recognized as the most important political event in modern history. Hitherto, the fact that it led to the foundation of the American Republic has been considered an adequate measure of its vast significance. But immense though that fact is, it is now beginning to be clearly seen that the American Revolution has had another effect of at least equal significance and probable influence upon the world's future. It compelled Great Britain, by the stern teaching of experience, to master the true principles of colonial government, and, as a consequence, to acquire the art of bringing her colonies into essential harmony with the national life. The folly of so-called statesmen, which reft from Great Britain her first great offshoot, left untouched the nation-building energy of her people, and around her has since grown up, in every quarter of the globe, a vast system of dependencies, occupying an eighth of the earth's surface and embracing even now a considerable portion of the world's population, with a capacity for enormous expansion. National development on such a scale is unparalleled in history, and must be pregnant with results. Already, as the process of expansion goes on, it has become manifest that this aggregation of states is slowly but surely outgrowing

the system under which it was created. The question of its reconstruction or adaptation to new conditions is undoubtedly one of the greatest of the world-problems now coming up for solution.

In one of his most striking poems Matthew Arnold speaks of England as

The weary Titan, with deaf
Ears, and labor-dimmed eyes,
Staggering on to her goal,
Bearing, on shoulders immense,
Atlantean, the load
Well-nigh not to be borne
Of the too vast orb of her fate.

It is not the poet's mind alone which is profoundly moved by this fact of Great Britain's vast expansion; by the question of whether she will continue able to bear her enormous burden of empire. Statesmen have to face the fact in all its gravity; nations in every quarter of the globe know that their future history depends, more than on anything else, on the answer given to the question. For the world at large, civilized and uncivilized, there is not at present, in the whole range of possible political variation, any question of such far-reaching significance as whether Great Britain shall remain a political unit, with effective energy equal to her actual and increasing greatness, or, yielding to some process of disintegration or dismemberment, shall abdicate her present position of world-wide influence, and suffer the great current of her national life to be broken up into many separate channels.

The growing influence, immense interests, and widening aspirations of the greater colonies—the commercial, legislative, and even social exigencies of the whole national system—make it clear that an answer to this great political problem cannot long be delayed. A profound movement of thought upon the subject has for the past few years been going on among British people in every part of the world. More recently, a great stimulus to discussion has been given by the formation of the Imperial Federation League, a society unofficial in its character, but guided or supported by many of the best minds of the empire, and apparently destined to become a rallying-point for a strong national enthusiasm.

Within a short time a remarkable change has come over public opinion in the British Isles themselves. Twenty years ago it almost seemed as if Great Britain was ready voluntarily to throw away her vast colonial empire. A whole school of politicians favored the idea, and seemed to have gained the public ear. The "Times," supposed to reflect public opinion, claimed that England was paying too high a price for enjoying the luxury of colonial loyalty, and warned the colonies to prepare for the separation that was inevitable.

John Bright's eloquence and Goldwin Smith's literary skill were alike employed in the same direction. Under such guidance, intoxicated by the success of free trade, and indulging in dreams of a cosmopolitan future which it was to produce for the nations, the British people seemed for a time to look upon the colonies as burdens which entailed responsibilities without giving any adequate return. All this has now been changed. John Bright in England and Goldwin Smith in Canada still

harp on the old string, but get no response from the popular heart, nor even from political parties. Great Britain has found that she still has to fight for her own hand, commercially and politically, and cannot afford to despise her natural allies. The vigor of colonial life, the expansion of colonial trade and power, the greatness of the part which the colonies are manifestly destined to take in affairs, have impressed even the slow British imagination. The integrity of the empire is fast becoming an essential article in the creed of all political parties. The idea appeals to the instincts of Great Britain's new democracy even more strongly than to the pride of her aristocracy, and with better reason, for the vast unoccupied areas of the empire in the colonies offer to the workingman a field of hope when the pressure at home has become too severe. Statesmen of the first rank, such as Earl Rosebery and the late W. E. Forster, have grasped the idea that national consolidation should form the supreme object of national policy, and have done what they could to develop the public sentiment which alone can make it such. The range of the national vision is widening; there is a tendency to look beyond the old ruts of European diplomacy to the nobler work and larger destiny opened up in the Greater Britain beyond the sea.

To the development of this wider view the growth of the United States has contributed largely. It has illustrated on a large scale the expansive energy of our race where the conditions are favorable. It has enlarged our conception of Anglo-Saxon self-governing capacity. It has shown that an unparalleled impulse to a nation's life may be given by vast breadth of territory with variety of climate and production. On the other hand, the British people see in the American Union proof that immense territorial extent is not incompatible, under modern conditions, with that representative system of popular government which had its birth and development in England and its most notable adaptation in America. They are beginning to believe that their political system will safely bear the strain of still further adaptation to wider areas, if the welfare or necessities of the empire demand a change. That they will demand it is a proposition now become so evident that it scarcely requires proof. The home population of Great Britain, which alone exercises national functions in their broadest sense, and bears the full burden of national responsibilities, is about thirty-five millions. This number has practically reached its outside limit of expansion. The Anglo-Saxon population of the empire abroad is already about eleven millions, and is increasing rapidly. It is a population which has already grouped itself into communities of national extent, self-governing, self-reliant, progressive, and with a clear sense of the large place which they are destined to fill in the world. The time cannot be very far distant when, by the flux of population and the process of growth, their numbers will equal or surpass those of the people of the British Isles. There can be no question that long before that period has arrived a readjustment of functions and responsibilities will be essential to the maintenance of the empire as a political unit. The British people at home cannot continue to bear alone the increasing burden of imperial duties. Great communities like Australia or Canada would disgrace the traditions of the race if they remained permanently content with anything short of an

equal share in the largest possible national life. For both mother land and colonies that largest life will unquestionably be found in organic national unity. The weight of public sentiment throughout the empire is at present strongly in favor of such unity, and national interest recommends it.

It is perhaps hard for Americans, imbued with traditions of the struggle by which their country threw off the yoke of an oppressive English Government, to understand how completely, and for what strong reasons, the relations between Great Britain and her present colonies are those of profound sympathy and warm affection. The mother land regards with natural pride the energy which is planting free political institutions and extending civilization in so many quarters of the globe; which is opening up such vast areas of virgin soil for British occupation, and which, by so doing, is preparing for her a solution of the difficult problem pressing upon her at home from dense population and limited land—a solution such as no other of the overcrowded nations of Europe can hope for. To the richness of her own past the colonies open a boundless vista of hope for the future. The colonies, on the other hand, feel equally proud of their unbroken connection with the grand traditions of the mother land. Little has occurred to mar the strength of this sentimental attachment. They have enjoyed the advantages of being members of a great empire without, as yet, bearing the severer weight of its burdens. All the perfect freedom of self-government for which they have asked has been ungrudgingly allowed. The population which is flowing into their waste lands comes chiefly from the mother country—not driven out by religious persecution or political tyranny, but the overflow of a fecund race, impelled by the spirit of enterprise, or in search of the larger breathing-space of new continents. In almost every case they come to strengthen the loyalty of the colony. The emigrant is encouraged or even assisted in leaving the old Britain; he is heartily welcomed in the new Britain beyond the seas. For generations afterwards his descendants speak of “going home” without feeling it necessary to explain that by “home” they mean England, Scotland or Ireland. Great Britain’s new colonial policy has thus given a new cohesion to the empire. Even in the case of a distinct race, with strong race instincts, it has achieved a marked success. French-Canadians are not only content with their political condition, but warmly loyal to British connection. Their greatest statesman emphasized, but scarcely exaggerated, this attitude of mind when he described himself as an Englishman speaking French. So high an authority as Cardinal Manning told me not long since that French-Canadian bishops and clergy had over and over again assured him that their people were practically a unit in preferring British to French connection. There is no doubt that in respect of either religious freedom or political security the preference is justified. The lapse of years bring into stronger relief the truth of Montalembert’s remark, that the Frenchmen of Canada had gained under British rule a freedom which the Frenchmen of France never knew.

With this sentiment, which makes unity possible, the national interest coincides. For the colonies the alternative is independence, when, as small and struggling nationalities, they will have to take their place

in a world which has developed distinct tendencies towards the agglomeration of immense states, and where absorption or comparative insignificance can alone await them. For Great Britain the choice is between amalgamating permanently in some way her strength and resources with those of the colonies, or abdicating the relatively foremost place which she now holds among the nations. The growth in population of the United States and the expansion of Russia are already beginning to dwarf by comparison all other nations. Those confined to Europe will, within the next fifty years, be out of the first rank. Great Britain alone, with unlimited room for healthful expansion on other continents, has the possibility of a future equal to the greatest; has the chance of retaining her hegemony as a ruling and civilizing power. Should she throw away the opportunity, her history will be one of arrested development. The process by which her vast colonial empire has come to her has been one of spontaneous growth, the outcome of a decisive national tendency. By inherent inclination the Anglo-Saxon is a trader. The character is one of which we need not feel ashamed. It has been found to consist in our history, with all the fighting energy of the Roman and much of the intellectual energy of the Greek. It does not seem incompatible with the moral energy of Christianity, and furnishes the widest opportunity for its exercise.

It has been under the impulse of this trading instinct that Great Britain has founded empire; to satisfy it, she must maintain empire. Among all the nations of the earth she stands in the unique position of owning by undisputed right immense areas of territory under every climate on the globe, and hence produces, or can produce, within her own national boundaries, all the raw materials of commerce. As civilization becomes more complex and more diffused, the products of every clime are, in an increasing ratio, laid under contribution to supply its manifold wants. Every step towards the complete national assimilation of so widespread an empire must favor the free exchange of commodities, with the necessary result of stimulating productive energy and developing latent resources. Every expansion of trade makes the security of trade a matter of increasing importance. For a race of traders, scattered over all quarters of the globe, peace, made secure by resting on organized power, is a supreme interest. The best guarantee of permanent peace that the world could have would be the consolidation of a great oceanic empire, the interests of whose members would lie chiefly in safe commercial intercourse. For filling such a place in the world Great Britain's position is absolutely unique among the nations of history. She holds the chief key to the commerce of the East in the passes of the Mediterranean and the Red seas. She commands an alternate route by the Cape of Good Hope. Across Canada she has yet a third, giving her for many purposes a still closer connection with the extreme East than do the other two. The geographical distribution of the coal areas under her control, and the defended or defensible harbors suitable for coaling stations contiguous to them, are among the most remarkable elements in her incomparable resources for prosecuting or protecting commerce in an age of steam. Already in electric connection with almost every important point in her dominions, her telegraph system only awaits the laying of

the proposed cable from British Columbia to Australasia to make that connection complete without touching on foreign soil.

Her widely separated provinces and outlying posts of vantage are thus effectively in touch for mutual support, more than the parts of any of the great nations of the past. She thus unites the comprehensiveness of a world-wide empire with a relative compactness secured by that practical contraction of our planet which has taken place under the combined influences of steam and electricity. No other nation has ever had—it is well nigh impossible to believe that any other nation ever will have—so commanding a position for exercising the functions of what we have called an oceanic empire, interested in developing and able to protect the commerce of the world. The question of whether she shall permanently retain this position is one of profound international as well as national concern. Above all, for the United States, as a great trading community, kindred in race, language, and, speaking very broadly, in national purpose, it must have a deep and abiding interest.

The political writers of the past century, from De Tocqueville onward, have been accustomed to draw from the American Revolution the confident inference that the natural tendency of colonies is towards separation from the mother land; that the growth of local interests and feelings of independence make new communities detach themselves, like ripe fruit, from the parent stem. If the birth of the American republic gave strength to this inference, its growth has done much to dissipate the idea. The development of the United States has proved that the spread of a nation over vast areas, including widely separated States with diverse interests, need not prevent it from becoming strongly bound together in a political organism which combines the advantages of national greatness and unity of purpose with jealously guarded freedom of local self-government. This is in part due to the amazing change which has been effected in the mutual relation of the world's inhabitants by improved means of speedy intercourse. Steam and electricity have re-created the world, and on a more accessible scale. Canada, or even Australia, is now much closer to the centre of the British Empire for all practical purposes than were the Western and Pacific States to Washington forty years ago. Under these new conditions there is no sufficient reason for doubting that an empire like that of Great Britain can be held together in bonds as secure as those which bind together great continental states like those of the United States and Russia, provided that the elements of true national life are present, as they certainly are in this case.

The federation of Great Britain and her colonies would only be an extension of what already has been done on a large scale. The United States are a federation, Germany is a federation, each designed by its framers to obviate the difficulties incident to the administration of a congeries of small states, and for great ends to secure unity of national action. The problem before Great Britain is different, but would seem to be incomparably less difficult than that involved in either of the two cases referred to. In Germany, dynasties and states whose individual existence had been carefully preserved and fondly cherished for centuries long presented an apparently insuperable barrier to union, effected at

last only under the strong pressure of external danger and in the enthusiasm of a great and successful struggle for race supremacy. Every student of American history knows the violent prejudices which had to be overcome and the extraordinary effort which it required to organize and gain acceptance for the Federal Constitution, even after the War of Independence had demonstrated the necessity for united action on the part of the various states. Sectional jealousies and rivalries have never been developed to a corresponding extent in the various provinces of the British Empire. For them federation would only be recasting and making more permanent a union which already exists, though under imperfect conditions. Besides this, the operation of the federal principle is now more thoroughly understood; its advantages have been gauged and its difficulties grappled with. The freedom of self-government long enjoyed by the great colonies has developed a strong feeling of local independence; but it has also been the best of all preparations for a wider political organization. Canada and Australia are to-day as jealous of imperial interference with local legislation as is any State of the Union of unjustified Federal assumptions. But as their autonomy in the control of their own affairs has become admitted and assured, they look without suspicion on the idea of combination having for its purpose the accomplishment of great national ends. These ends have become more manifest with the spread of their commerce to every part of the world, and with the manifold multiplication of national interests. Questions of peace and war: the safety of the great ocean routes; the adjustment of international differences; the relations of trade, currency, communication, emigration—in all these their concern is already large, and becomes larger from year to year. In dealing with all such questions their voice, as component parts of a great empire, will be far more efficient than as struggling independent nationalities. That voice is, in a measure given to them now by courtesy, and as a necessary concession to their growing importance; but for permanent nationality it must be theirs by ordinary right of citizenship, through full incorporation into the political system of the state, so far as relations with other states are concerned. Those who believe it impracticable to give unity of this kind to the empire underestimate the strength of the influences which make for the continuity of national life. On this continent we see to-day a sufficiently striking illustration of this strength. We can easily understand that it requires no very marked natural boundary to form a permanent line of separation between nations which differ in language, religion and descent, as in the case of European states. But in America an almost purely arbitrary line of division has for more than a century served sharply to separate into two nationalities, and across the breadth of a continent, two peoples who are of the same origin, speak the same language, study the same literature, and are without any decisive distinctions of religious creed. The admitted present loyalty of Canada has deepened and matured through a long series of years when the United States were sweeping past them in a career of prosperity almost without example in history, and when union with them seemed as if it would secure for Canada an equal share of all the prosperity that they enjoyed. The bias of national life has been so strong that neither geographical facts nor

commercial tendencies have weakened the national bond. Nor are they more likely to do so now that Canada has, by the opening up of her great western provinces, manifestly entered upon a like period of development.

In spite of this evidence of a century's history Mr. Goldwin Smith still argues that trade interests will ultimately draw Canada into political connection with the United States, and apparently does not understand why his opinion is rejected with indignation by the vast majority of Canadians. Yet it seems impossible to conceive how, without a debasement of public sentiment quite unparalleled in history, a people whose history began in loyalty to British institutions, who through a hundred years have been sheltered by British power, who under that rule have attained and enjoyed the most complete political and religious liberty, who have constantly professed the most devoted regard for a mother land with which they are connected by a thousand ties of affectionate sympathy, should deliberately, in cold blood, and for commercial reasons only, break that connection and join themselves to a state in whose history and traditions they have no part. They would incur, and unquestionably would deserve, alike the contempt of the people they abandon and of the people they join. In a Great Britain reorganized as a federation, or union, or alliance, Canada would hold an honorable place, gained on lines of true national development; in annexation to the United States she could have nothing but a bastard nationality, the offspring of either meanness, selfishness, or fear.

What is thus true of Canada is true of the other British colonies as well. The forces which make for unity and continuity of national life are not only strong, but noble and natural.

The argument for unity may be carried to still higher ground. A strong impulse has unquestionably been given to national effort and earnestness, both in Great Britain and the United States, by the prevailing conviction that Anglo-Saxon civilization is a thing distinct in itself and with a mission in the world. Granting the truth of this, we must also grant that any hindrance to the safe and free development of that civilization in either of its two great currents would be to the world's loss. In the United States, through its isolation, it seems comparatively secure to deal with the complex problem, weighted with grave anxieties, which it has to solve in the assimilation and elevation of confluent races. Great Britain's task, more diversified and world-wide, seems burdened with even greater responsibilities, and not free from great dangers. The enormous expansion and persistent ambition of at least one great despotic power, the possibility of combinations against her such as she has had to face before but may not be able again to cope with single-handed, point to the necessity for national consolidation if she is to have that prestige of national power which commands peace, or if she is to form a sufficient bulwark for the free institutions to which she has given birth in many lands.

Great Britain, again, has assumed vast responsibilities in the government of weak and alien races—responsibilities which she cannot now throw off, even if she wish to, without a loss of national honor. With increasing force the public conscience insists that her rule shall be for the good of the ruled; none deny that the removal of her sway, in Asia

and Africa at least, would result in wide-spread anarchy. But her task is herculean.

An empire which has leaning upon it an Indian population of two hundred and forty millions over and above the native races of Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and many minor regions must require, if stability and equilibrium are to be permanently maintained, an immense counterbalancing weight of that trained, intelligent, and conscientious citizenship which is the backbone of national strength.

Standing face to face, as she does to-day, with almost every uncivilized and unchristian race on the globe, Great Britain needs to concentrate her moral as well as her political strength for the work she has to do. Neither British statesmen nor British Christians can afford to lose one fraction of the moral energy which is becoming centralized in the great colonies. Great Britain's political unity and dominance are to the spread of religion in Africa, Asia, and the Pacific now what Rome's political unity and dominance were to the spread of religion in the days of St. Paul. The fact that the flag of a firmly organized oceanic state will everywhere give the greatest safety to the missionary will, without doubt, ultimately throw the whole weight of Christian thought throughout the British world towards the support of permanent national unity. The sympathy of Christian thought in America ought to and will re-enforce this influence.

Working out on separate and yet parallel lines the great problems of liberty and of civil and religious progress, the United States and Great Britain have the strongest reasons for sympathizing with each other's efforts to consolidate and perfect the national machinery by which their aims are to be accomplished. Great Britain now understands and respects the motives which actuated the resolute and successful struggle of the American people against disruption. A nation which suffered and sacrificed so much for unity as did the United States can assuredly understand and sympathize with the strong desire for national consolidation which is now spreading throughout the British Empire.

It has long been a Saxon boast that while other races require to be governed, we are able to govern ourselves. To this kingly power, in every state of our development, new and more comprehensive tests have been applied. From the organization of the parish or county to that of States which span a continent this self-governing capacity has not failed to find the political device adapted to the political necessity. It would now seem that the British people stand face to face with the ultimate test to which this ability can be put. Have they the grasp of political genius to establish permanently on a basis of mutual benefit and organic unity the empire which they have had the energy to create?

When a great nation ceases to advance, or loses control of the problems involved in its own growth, we can safely say that decadence has begun. Nations as well as individuals find their true place when challenging their highest destiny, provided this be along the lines of natural development. But beyond these general reasons there are others of present and pressing weight which will soon compel the British people to grapple resolutely with this great political problem. The increasing

pressure and unequal distribution of national burdens, the inability of Parliament to unite the management of imperial affairs with local legislation, the immense strides in arts or arms made by rival nations, the widening aspirations of the great colonies—these are but a few among many influences by which is being developed that weight of opinion which forces questions forward into the sphere of practical politics, compels statesmen to find some form of expression for the public will, and for the attainment of great ends makes masses of people willing to forget minor differences.

DR. BEERS' SPEECH AT SYRACUSE, N.Y.

NOVEMBER, 1888.

"CANADA NOT FOR SALE."

At the banquet of the 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th Districts Dental Societies of the State of New York, held in Syracuse recently, when 250 members from all parts of the State attended, including many ladies, several judges and clergymen, Drs. Willmott, Cæsar, Roberts and Snelgrove, of Toronto, and Dr. Beers, of Montreal, were present. I am able, through the courtesy of Mr. R. L. Spearman, shorthand reporter, to send you Dr. Beers' reply to the strangely worded toast, "Professional Annexation." Dr. Beers spoke as follows: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen,—I must confess to a good deal of embarrassment in replying to a toast which is intended to be both professional and political, but I have been specially asked to do so by the chairman, and if I should offend any one, as I must say exactly what I think, I can only offer to settle on the spot by inviting you, as the boys say, to "come out in the alley!" I have neither the presumption nor the vanity to imagine that I am able to do justice to the personal and professional courtesies which Doctor Jonathan has always bestowed upon his Canadian friends, as well as to the magnificent ignorance—sometimes ill-nature—which Senator Jonathan has recently lavished upon his Canadian foes. But I can assure you that not even the professional liars who supply the New York *Herald* with Canadian news, or the wily politicians who eat forked lightning for breakfast and dynamite for dinner; not even the insane malice of men who hate Canada, as they may hate Cyprus, because it belongs to Britain; not even this can lessen the admiration Canadians have for the many noble and generous traits of character which belong to their American cousins. I am sure I speak, too, for my brethren from loyal Toronto, when I say that we have too often been under deep professional obligations to the kind nature of the cousin we still, from custom, call "brother," not to know that, however we differ politically, you

RESPECT OUR NATIONAL CONVICTIONS

as you wish your own respected; and that as you choose to hit at us hard, you have enough of English fair play to take a drubbing back, and to allow the possibility of Canadians loving and defending the fame and good name of the Dominion, quite as much as you love and defend that of your Republic. No one more than loyal Americans would despise the paltroon who carries his patriotism in his pocket; the disloyalty of the political parasite who would make patriotism a house of cards, and

dollars the chief end of a people ; intriguers who hiss out secession or annexation when they fail to get their political crimes or crotchets enshrined ; men whose hunger for notoriety and power is a fever of their existence. I am sure that you could have nothing but contempt for any free people who measure their allegiance purely by commercial standards, and who, fearing to face the difficulties which meet every nation, turn peddlers instead of protectors of their national birthright. Just as you had and have your croakers and cowards we have ours, but, Mr. Chairman, Canada is not for sale ! There have been prophets like Goldwin Smith since the days of Elizabeth who have predicted England's decline within their time, but all the colonial greatness of England has been developed since the time of Elizabeth. We have, as you have, bitter partisans in the press and in politics who delight to foul their own nest, who revel in the rain that destroys the crops, and who sincerely believe they can change the climate if they could change the Government. We have a few of those wiseacres of society who assume to possess the monopoly of foresight, and who, like Caius Caligula, think the world would have been better made could they have been consulted. But these people no more represent the convictions of Canadians than O'Donovan Rossa or your fire-eating politicians and papers represent those of true Americans. I have no desire to hurt anybody's feelings here, but I hope I may be allowed to say something to remove the infatuation too prevalent in the States that

CANADA FAVORS ANNEXATION.

Were we to judge you as you judge us—by the vamping of the croakers, what value could we put upon your union, and would we not feel like agreeing with Rossiter Johnson, who in his "Short History of the War of Secession," just published in Boston, thinks he sees in certain national circumstances the threatening elements of a second civil war ? For years before the last civil war you had fire-eaters whose arrogance and vanity knew no bounds ; who were advised by the Canadian press to study the elements of discord in the South instead of hankering for new ones in the North. It was just the same when years before that Georgia and Carolina appealed to arms and defied the general Government. Surely two threatened disruptions and one terrible civil war in the history of a century should be enough. But last Fourth of July I was near enough the "Reunion of the North and South" on the battlefield of Gettysburg, to see the ex-Confederates wearing the starred and barred badge, with the inscription upon it, "That was the flag of treason and rebellion in 1861, and it is the flag of treason and rebellion in 1888." I read the protests of General Wagner, General Gobin and the Quartermaster-General of the Grand Army of the Republic against the gush and glorification of rebels because they had been rebels. I heard one officer boast that Southern privateers had destroyed \$500,000,000 of your property, and had driven a quarter of a million tons of your shipping to make transfer to the British flag. I heard another gloat over the fact that they had nearly captured Philadelphia. I heard scores declare that they had not been beaten but starved. Reflecting upon all this, and hearing at this very hour the

discordant echoes from that quarter, it strikes me that if Senators like Mr. Blaine are sincere in their effusive professions of patriotism, they could find a good deal to monopolize their genius down there in Dixie without meddling in the politics or the future of Canada. Canada minds its own business, and does not worry itself over yours, though you have coddled and dry-nursed her enemies, and when she was at peace with you, allowed a horde of your citizens to invade her. Frankly, I may say that while I believe Canada

HAS BEEN A FAIR NEIGHBOR,

too often she had not found her cousin one. If for once in the Treaty of Washington, remembering Maine, Oregon and San Juan, she did not let your diplomatists get the better of her, she felt that she had given you at least a reasonable *quid pro quo*. During the civil war we allowed your armed troops to cross from Detroit to Niagara on Canadian territory on the Great Western railway; but during the Red River rebellion of 1869, your Government refused leave to one of our vessels to go up the Sault Ste. Marie canal, and arms and ammunition were transhipped at considerable delay. When the St. Albans raiders, unknown to us, entered your territory from Canada, your Government was asked for its bill of damages and it was paid. When the Alabama claims' bill was presented, it was paid so well that, years after every possible claim was settled, your government retains a large balance which should have been refunded to Britain! What about the damages done to Canada in Canada by your citizens during the Fenian raids, most of them wearing the uniform of branches of your national troops? Not a cent has been paid. You expected Canada to know that a few quiet and straggling Southerners intended to raid St. Albans; you thought that England should have known that a solitary cruiser intended leaving one of her ports to prey upon your commerce. But what a splendid display of reciprocal consistency, that thousands of armed men should openly muster and drill in your chief cities for months before; openly occupy your border towns and villages, and attempt to invade us, and your Government comparatively oblivious! In the face of these facts, it is not easy to swallow the statements or believe in the honesty of public men who talk of the exactions and encroachments of a people of 6,000,000 upon a people of 60,000,000.

CANADA CANNOT BE COERCED

or forced into union with such examples of political hypocrisy.

There was a time, twenty years ago, when we were discontented provinces; when Canada proper contained only 370,488 square miles; when we had few railways; when stagnation seemed to mark us; when we had no winter outlet of our own to the sea; when our great Northwest was a great unknown. Even then annexation was unpopular. There had not been enough accomplished then by Canadian statesmen to make their rivals envious, and your own statesmen did not dream that we could build a railway to connect the Maritime and the old provinces, or that with a population of only 6,000,000, we would dare to span the continent with another, a work not accomplished by the States until they had 50,000,000. But can you be deceived into the belief that

confederated Canada is now for sale, when since Confederation, twenty years ago, our revenue or consolidated fund has immensely increased; when our shipping and its tonnage has more than doubled—young Canada standing fifth on the list of nations; having more vessels than old France, Spain, Italy or Russia; when the assets of our chartered banks, the value of our imports, the extent of our exports tell a story of our marvellous progress; when, instead of about 2,000 miles of railway in 1867, we have now over 14,000, giving us a greater length of mileage than any other part of the Empire, excepting the United Kingdom and India; when the Canadian Pacific railway has established a line of steamers between Vancouver and Hong Kong and Japan, and our great Canadian line has become of Imperial importance; when we have developed our inexhaustible fisheries, thanks to your abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty, so that we have 75,000 hardy men sailing our vessels and otherwise engaged in the business, and for 1887 we value those fisheries at \$20,000,000! Can you wonder that annexation, as a serious subject, has received its doom, and that in spite of the intoxication of senatorial conceit on the one side, and the croaking of malcontents and political tramps on the other, Canada is loyal to the Mother Country, from whose stout old loins both of us sprang? Confederated Canada, respected Canada, loyal Canada, progressive Canada is a personal and political insult to the sore-head parties who opposed Confederation, and who would welcome

ANNEXATION TO TURKEY OR RUSSIA

were we neighbors, or rejoice even at annihilation rather than live the agonizing life of seeing their prospects and predictions destroyed.

There were millions of your own citizens glad to do their worst to dismember your union; there were thousands who gave their lives to wreck the Republic that their own State interests might be promoted. Yet when a few obscure cranks in Canada declare in favor of annexation, you think they speak the sentiment of a sober people who do not find it necessary to indulge in the spectacular or the rhetorical that you may see and hear the truth. You choose to ignore the treason of many a Southern newspaper to-day as you did twenty-five years ago, and you exalt as gospel the partisans of the Canadian press, who are incapable of telling the truth.

Personally and professionally, I am sure any dentist who visits you forgets he is not an American, and I am sure we try to make Americans coming to Canada forget they are not Canadians. You have big and hospitable hearts that were intended for hospitality and not for quarrel. Personally and even commercially we can find so many points of common agreement that we should overlook the few where we must agree to differ.

Politically, I realize I am a foreigner here the moment I cross the line. I am at home when I land at Liverpool, at Glasgow, at Dublin, at Bermuda, New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, New Guinea, Jamaica, Barbados or Trinidad. Politically I have a share in, and am proud of, the glorious old flag which waves over New Zealand, Australia, Gibraltar, Malta, Hong Kong, West Africa, Ceylon, St. Helena,

Natal, British Honduras, Dominica, the Bahamas, Grenada, Barbadoes, India. England is an old and apt master in annexation. Since she lost the thirteen colonies here, she has annexed colonies far greater in area and population, of far more value to her than if they were joined to her three kingdoms, while Spain, Portugal, Holland and France have lost theirs, and there is little or nothing left for any other nation to annex. I need no other political passport to the rights of a British subject, and the citizen of a great realm, comprising 65 territories and islands, than my Canadian birthright. I do not measure my national boundary from the Atlantic to the Pacific, but from the Pacific round to the Caribbean Sea.

UNDER THE REIGN OF VICTORIA

no Canadian need be ashamed to belong to an Empire which embraces a fifth of the habitable globe, and to know that his own Dominion forms nearly a half of the whole ; an Empire five times as large as that which was under Darius ; four times the size of that under ancient Rome ; sixteen times greater than France ; 40 times greater than United Germany ; three times larger than the United States. Australia alone nearly as big as the States ; India nearly a million and a quarter of square miles ; Canada, 600,000 square miles larger than the States, without Alaska ; and 18,000 square miles larger with it ! An Empire nearly 9,000,000 of square miles, with a population of 310,000,000.

Sharers in such a realm ; heirs to such vast and varied privileges, Canadians are not for sale. Political annexation must then remain a bug-a-boo for disappointed politicians on our side to play with, and a bubble for certain Senators on this side to blow to decoy their innocent fanatics at home. But there is an annexation we favor, that of brotherly friendship and political good-will. You have 54,000,000 the start of us. Are you the Goliath afraid of Canada as a political David ? Canada has been a good neighbor. When Lincoln and Garfield died, the Dominion was in mourning. Whenever any of your men-of-war come into our ports, the citizens rejoice, and give their men the hospitalities of the cities. There are constant reciprocity treaties being made every day in the years between us at the altar of Hymen. At many of our banquets the toast of the President follows that to the Queen. At most of our public gatherings your flag entwines ours. From most of our pulpits prayers are offered for your ruler as well as for ours. That is the sort of alliance we do more than you do to promote. We want, too, fair commercial reciprocity, but we shall not take commercial union for it, or bend our necks or our knees for either. Whatever besides, we can both be loyal to our own political countries ; we can both be fair, even to our own national and natural prejudices, and while Canadians may neighborly pray " God bless the Republic," may you not in as friendly a spirit reciprocate with " God Save the Queen."

MR. CATTANACH'S LETTER TO THE GLOBE

FEBRUARY, 1889.

The Object is Union Through Discussion—Difficulties that Can be Solved Only by Conference between the Parties Affected—British Connection as Opposed to Independence or Annexation.

TO THE EDITOR:—The charge that the Imperial Federation League has not yet presented any definite scheme or object is, I think, unfounded.

It should be borne in mind at the outset that a gigantic scheme like the federation of the British Empire comprehends so many local and diverse interests that it could not be expected that one section of the Empire could propound a scheme which would meet universal acceptance. Great Britain has her own peculiar interests, and the interests of the different colonies and dependencies are as various as these are numerous. The interests of Canada differ from those of Australia; and those of the African Colonies from both of them. To bring all these various interests into line it is obvious that in the first place there must be negotiation, and in the next place there must be a giving and taking between them in order to come to an understanding. What would suit one would not altogether suit the other; but if they have a common object in view the tendency would undoubtedly be to find a common basis for action.

The Federation League then, rightly or wrongly believing it would be advantageous and feasible to form a union, starts with the idea that this can be best realized by forming associations for discussing the subject with a view to arriving at the best conclusion with the aid of public opinion. This was laid down as

THE MAIN OBJECT OF THE LEAGUE

at a conference held in London on the 29th of July, 1884, under the presidency of the Right Hon. W. E. Forster. And Lord Rosebery, the present president of the British League, added to this in his Edinburgh address of the 17th of November, 1887, in substance, that when the subject is thoroughly threshed out it will, although not in any sense a party question, come within the domain of the politicians or various Governments concerned. The League therefore presents at least one definite object to the public, viz.: Union, and as a means to that end, discussion. To my mind there is something unquestionably definite in the proposal to form a union of all the members of the British Empire for purposes of mutual benefit and defence, although there are many difficulties to be solved which can only be solved by conference between the parties affected. When we speak of Commercial Union we speak of something

sufficiently definite for discussion ; and yet it presents great difficulties in detail, and particularly so when the interests of Great Britain and the likelihood or unlikelihood of her giving her assent are taken into account. Federation presents the idea of a British connection as

OPPOSED TO INDEPENDENCE OR ANNEXATION,

which to my mind is a distinct conception. It also aims at the preservation and defence of all parts of the Empire. This, too, presents a definite idea, which may be worked out in detail if we wish it. We know that it is a matter of common occurrence for nations that have nothing in common except the maintenance of their existence to form alliances for defensive and sometimes offensive purposes. They first settle that it would be desirable and then they enter on details. When Bismarck first suggested to Italy that it would be to their common advantage to form an alliance, was there not something definite in the proposal ? and yet, no doubt, there were great difficulties and important details to settle before the alliance was consummated. If we at once come to the conclusion that it would be to our advantage, and the advantage of the Empire at large, to enter into an alliance for our preservation, we shall have made definite progress ; and at that point the League has already arrived. And so would it also be with regard to questions of trade and our relations with other powers ; the only difference being that the trade question presents greater difficulties. No one will deny that it would be of great advantage to us if our trade relations with all the parts of the Empire could be enlarged. This is

ONE OF THE AIMS OF THE LEAGUE.

We should encounter great difficulties no doubt in forming a trade league owing particularly to our rivalry with the United States and to differences of opinion on questions of Free Trade and Protection. But no one can say that these difficulties are insuperable or that present opinions on these questions will always remain unchanged. If we cannot gain all we want by Federation, we can certainly gain much, and the trial is worth the making. In all these matters our relations with the United States would be an important factor in our arrangements. We do not lose sight of this, and we believe that Federation would in the end establish the most friendly relations between ourselves and our neighbors, which it is our wish as well as interest to maintain.

Space does not permit me to enter into a discussion of the advantages which would result from Federation, and my object now is simply to show that we have definite objects and think Federation feasible.

And now a few words as to our scheme. The general impression among those who are not familiar with the constitution of the League is that an Imperial Parliament or Executive Council, composed of delegates or representatives from the different members of the Empire, is indispensable to the scheme of Federation, and it must be admitted that the word "Federation" is calculated to give that impression. But Lord Rosebery, the authoritative mouthpiece of the League in England, refused to commit the League to this as an article of its creed. There would be at least very great difficulty in getting Britain and the great

self-governing powers to commit vital interests to a deliberative body of any kind which was not entirely of their own creation and especially a body representing a great variety of interests. But still, until there is a

CONFERENCE OF THE DIFFERENT BODIES

to consider the question, it is impossible to say that there are no important subjects which might not be committed to the decision of such a body. If there is to be a community of interest on given subjects much could be said in favor of there being somebody to settle questions which might arise from time to time. A Consultative Council would be beneficial at any rate, as subjects affecting the Empire could be discussed from all points of view. If Canada became a part of the United States she would have to give up many sovereign rights.

How then could Federation be fairly denounced, off hand, on the ground that it might involve the surrender of some rights. We had better learn first what rights we have to surrender and then what we are asked to surrender. But, as I have stated, a Parliament or Executive Council is not held by the League to be an indispensable part of the scheme of Federation. It is thought by many that after public opinion has been brought to bear on these questions a common understanding could be arrived at on many, if not all points, by means of conferences between delegates from the different sections of the Empire interested in Federation; and that when the subject had reached this stage it would then come within the domain of statesmanship and be dealt with first by representatives of the different Governments concerned, met for the purpose of trying to come to an understanding, and then by their Parliaments or Legislatures which might accept or reject or propose modifications.

THE ULTIMATE DECISION

would thus rest with the people so far as their particular interests were concerned. It is confidently believed that in this way Federation could be accomplished without any radical political changes; that Colonies could retain all the powers they might think requisite for working out their own destiny; and that difficulties would gradually disappear until what is now a complicated problem would become a simple one. An illustration will perhaps best explain what I mean. Supposing that one of the results of such conferences should be that Britain was willing to stipulate that our mercantile navy and coasts should be defended by the Imperial navy if we were willing to pay a stipulated annual sum towards its maintenance. The question of what we should do could be considered and dealt with by ourselves without delegation, and, speaking for myself, I have no doubt that many, if not all, of the matters involved in Federation could be similarly dealt with.

This is surely definite enough for us to work up to; and is it not worth working for? If the arrangements made required changing afterwards there is no reason for supposing that they would not be changed.

And finally as to the necessity of any action just now, on our part, to change our status. I for one would be well content to let matters go on as at present for many years. But is there any possibility of that?

Canada has reached a point at which her future is not only a matter of great interest to herself, but to others ; and she must soon accept

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF A NATION

in some form or other. On the 7th of August, 1887, Mr. Sherman, one of the shrewdest and most distinguished statesmen in the United States, said in his place in the Senate, "I want Canada to be a part of the United States. Within ten years from this time the Dominion of Canada will, in my judgment, be represented either in the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain or in the Congress of the United States." Mr. Culhom, the chairman of the Senate Committee on the relations between the United States and Canada, said, a few weeks ago, that it was, in his opinion, the duty of the United States so to shape the course of events that the American flag should float over Canada within a few years. This is quite in keeping with the action of the President and Senate in reference to retaliation and other matters affecting Canada. Mr. Blaine and many other politicians might be quoted. The New York press has taken up the subject. It is discussed not only by men, but also by women, in the United States; and a map has just been published showing how the United States would look if Canada formed a part of it. There are some amongst ourselves, very few I am glad to say, who favor Annexation, and our city press almost daily discusses

THE QUESTION OF OUR FUTURE

as one of the present. Under these circumstances we, who have faith in our country and who aspire to become a great nation, think the time has come for speaking out and for letting England as well as the United States know that we do not wish to sever our connection with the land of our ancestors; that we think the separation of Britain from her Colonies would seal her doom; and that both in her interest and our own we are prepared to do all we can to maintain the connection, at any rate, with the Mother Country. We have not the same affection for other Colonies as we have for the parent State, nor is our interest in them so great. And if the larger scheme of Federation should be found impracticable there is no reason why we should not make our own arrangements with the Imperial Government. I have a strong opinion that Britain, while willing to give us everything we want, will never willingly surrender her right—a right which is absolutely hers at present—of using the Canadian Pacific railway as a road between England and the East, and of coaling at what may be called both ends of that line, which are matters of great commercial and military importance to her. It is too readily taken for granted that Britain would willingly let Canada go. And if such a proposal were made in earnest it would very soon appear that England's ancient instinct for trade is just as keen as ever and that we should have to face a much more serious problem than Federation.

A. J. CATTANACH,

President Toronto Branch Imperial Federation League.

Toronto, Feb. 25.

AN INTERVIEW WITH MR. HOPKINS

(ONE OF THE SECRETARIES OF THE LEAGUE IN CANADA)

ON THE

PROGRESS OF THE MOVEMENT OF IMPERIAL FEDERATION.

APRIL, 1889.

THE EMPIRE yesterday had a pleasant interview with Mr. J. Castell Hopkins, one of the secretaries of the Imperial Federation League in the Dominion, during the course of which the following conversation took place :

What progress has the league been making of late ?

About a year ago we had branches established in Montreal, Ingersoll, Halifax, Peterboro', Ottawa and Toronto. Since then we have organized in Brantford, Port Arthur, St. Thomas, Orillia, Lindsay and county of Victoria, St. John, N.B., Chatham, Ont., Pictou, N.S., Wiarton, Belleville and Kingston. One distinguishing feature of the movement so far has been the way in which it seems to have appealed to all classes of the people and all parts of the country. The St. John, N.B., branch has for its president the veteran Sir Leonard Tilley, and for vice-presidents the Warden of St. John county, the Mayor of the city and the Mayor of Portland, N.B. The county of Victoria branch is most complete in its organization, and comprises amongst its officers and executive the leading men of all occupations and political opinions to be found within the county. So, in Montreal, the first branch in the Dominion, and one of the most active, the membership is made up of leading business men as well as of politicians and lawyers. The president of the Halifax branch is Sir Adams Archibald ; of the league in Victoria, B.C., Sir Matthew Begbie, Chief Justice of British Columbia ; of the Ottawa branch, Mr. Sandford Fleming, and of the newly-formed Kingston branch, Principal Grant. Another marked feature is the spontaneous nature of the movement. Men are thinking, writing and speaking about the future of the Empire in all directions, without concerted action in many cases, and yet with a clearly visible effect, upon the development of what was a few years ago merely an idea, into an actual working policy. Since the formation of the Organizing Committee of the league a few months ago in this city, I have had some means of judging (as its honorable secretary) of the entirely natural, not forced growth of our principles. From Halifax to Vancouver come enquiries as to the platform of the league, and the mode of forming branches, with innumerable requests for literature dealing with the subject.

What steps are being taken by the league to further its objects ?

At the close of the year a council meeting was held at which a committee was appointed for the purpose of promoting a conference between the self-governing colonies to consider trade and other relations. The result of the committee's consideration was the sending of a circular letter on behalf of the league to the more prominent politicians of our sister colonies, inviting their co-operation in the matter, and pointing out the great possibilities of trade which the building of the C.P.R. and the establishment of cable and steam communication must in the future create. In addition to this step, Mr. George R. Parkin is now on his way to Australia to conduct a campaign there on behalf of our principles in accordance with the pressing invitation of the league in Victoria. In this connection, I might say that Mr. Parkin's meetings during his tour through Canada were most successful. Crowded houses greeted him at St. John, N.B., Ottawa, St. Thomas, Kingston, Belleville, Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver. Principal Grant has, since his return from Australia, also delivered most eloquent addresses at Ottawa and Kingston. I may say here that branches are in course of formation at Woodstock, Picton, Cookstown, Barrie, Calgary, Yarmouth, N.S., St. Mary's, Vancouver, B.C., Winnipeg, Paisley, Brampton and Hamilton.

Much difference of opinion prevails, I believe, Mr. Hopkins, as to the policy of Imperial Federationists. Can you tell me what the league is aiming at ?

Well, it would seem to me that all advocates of this policy are united in believing that we should resist attempts at disintegration of the Empire in whatever part of the world they may arise; that we should strive to educate the public mind as to the benefits of British institutions and of Imperial unity, and the advantages to be derived from making that union permanent and establishing it upon a more equal and satisfactory footing. As regards the platform of the league, it has recently been summed up by our President, Lord Rosebery, in the words: "The closest possible union—in sympathy, in external action, in defence." It would seem to be generally recognized that there are three distinct branches of the question, and that we may attain them all in time, but that even if only one is gained it is a result well worth striving for. I should be disposed to sum them up in the following order :

- I. Combination for mutual defence.
- II. Co-operation for commercial purposes.
- III. Consolidation of existing political relations.

The way in which we expect to attain our object may be described as that of gradual development upwards, not revolution, but evolution, from the Colonial status of to-day to the national position of the future; from the dependency of the present, to the Federal State of the time to come, by means chiefly of consultative conferences; the development of trade, cable and steam communication between the different parts of the Empire.

It is often asserted that there are few prominent supporters of the movement either in England or the colonies. Is that a fact ?

I think that the best reply to that question will be to give the names

of a few of the more distinguished Federationists, and here I would like to say that many old-time advocates of Canadian independence are now joining the league, as offering in its platform the truest and best system of independence in Canada. There are some sixty members of the Senate and Commons upon our council, with many men distinguished in business and legal circles, amongst whom may be mentioned Hon. G. E. Foster, Minister of Finance; Hon. C. H. Tupper, Minister of Marine; Hon. G. W. Allen, Hon. J. R. Gowan, Hon. J. C. Schultz, Dalton McCarthy, Q.C., M.P., president, and Alex. McNiell, M.P., vice-president of the league in Canada; Adam Brown, M.P., Sir Adam Wilson, late chief justice; G. R. R. Cockburn, M.P., C. N. Skinner, M.P., Sir D. A. Smith, M.P., H. A. Ward, M.P., N. Clarke Wallace, M.P., Geo. Hague, general manager Merchants' Bank; Andrew Robertson, of Montreal; T. Wolbertson Thomas, general manager Molsons Bank; J. G. Bourinot, Ottawa; E. F. Clarke, M.P.P., mayor of Toronto; Bishop Courtney, of Nova Scotia, and Archbishop O'Brien, of Halifax. In Great Britain the number of leading men who favor our principles is so great as to defy mention, Lord Aberdeen, Lord Ashbourne, Lord Charles Beresford, Lord Brabourne, Henry Broadhurst, M.P., a pronounced Radical and formerly Under Secretary of State; Prof. James Price, M.P., Lord Carnarvon, Sir Donald Currie, M.P., Lord Dunraven, Sir James Fergusson, M.P., General Sir Gerald Graham, Lord George Hamilton, M.P., Lord Herschill, Sir M. Hicks-Beach, M.P., Rt. Hon. Ed. Stanhope, M.P., Prof. Montague Burrows, M.P., Prof. G. G. Stokes, M.P., the Bishops of Littlefield and Rochester, Lord Knutsford, Sir Jno. Lubbock, M.P., Sir Lyon Playfair, M.P., Lord Tennyson, Prof. J. R. Seeley, Lord Rosebery are all upon the list of our council. Sir John Macdonald is a member of the council in Britain, while Hon. Oliver Mowat seconded the resolution which formed the league in London in the year 1884. In Australasia a few of our prominent supporters are Hon. James Service, late Premier, and the Hon. D. Gillies, present Premier of Victoria; Sir Samuel Griffith, late Premier of Queensland; Sir John Downer, Premier of South Australia, and Hon. J. C. Bray, late Premier; Sir Arthur Blyth, South Australia; Sir Daniel Cooper, of New South Wales; Sir Charles Gaven Duffy, late Premier of Victoria; Sir William Fox and Sir William Fitzherbert, Sir Robert Stout and Sir Harry Atkinson, of New Zealand; Sir Arthur Hodgson, of Queensland; Sir Charles Nicholson, N.S.W.; Sir Saul Samuel, N.S.W.; Sir Francis Smith, of Tasmania, and many more. I think that I have named sufficient to controvert any statement as to our lack of prominent supporters.

Is the league then satisfied with the progress it has been making?

Yes. I feel certain that we have no cause for discontent, but every ground for satisfaction. Throughout the self-governing parts of the Empire the sentiment is daily growing in favor of closer union, and this is most clearly shown in the utterances of men high in position in the Mother Land and elsewhere, who dare not run counter to this rapidly rising tide of opinion. Mr. Gladstone, when he said in a recent letter that he "should view with the utmost satisfaction throughout the British Empire, a more thorough and substantial union of the different countries

and peoples paying allegiance to her Majesty," no doubt expressed the view of a majority of the Liberal party in Great Britain. Mr. Chamberlain spoke as follows, a year ago at the Devonshire Club, saying "that he was well aware that up to the present time no practical scheme of federation had been submitted, but he did not think that such a scheme was impossible. There were two points which had to be prominently borne in mind. There was the question of commercial union within the Empire and the question of union for defence." I believe that the Prince of Wales voiced the sentiments of the great mass of the British people when he recently stated that "we regard the colonies as integral parts of the Empire, and our warmest sympathies are with our brethren beyond the sea, who are no less dear to us than if they dwelt in Surrey or in Kent." And I think, further, that Mr. Wilfrid Laurier outlined the true policy for the Canadian people when he said at Somerset, Quebec, in August, 1887: "It is a matter to be hoped that those nations which recognize the sovereignty of Great Britain may be united by commercial union, so as to open up trade with Australia and other countries." Enough has been said, however, to show what progress we have made, what support we have obtained and what we desire to effect. Our hopes for the future, I can merely say, are as boundless as is the power and prosperity which will attend our Dominion and our Empire if Imperial Federation becomes a fact.



